

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4
5

6 STEPHEN MORRIS and KELLY
7 McDANIEL, on behalf of themselves and all
8 others similarly situated,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 ERNST & YOUNG, LLP, and ERNST &
12 YOUNG U.S., LLP,

13 Defendants.

Case No. 12-cv-04964-RMW (HRL)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
EXCEED APPLICABLE PAGE LIMIT
FOR MOTION TO DISMISS, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, STAY PROCEEDINGS
AND COMPEL ARBITRATION
BRIEFING**

[Re Dkt. No. 43]

14 On January 23, 2013, the parties filed a proposed order and stipulation to extend the applicable
15 page limit by ten (10) pages for both the opposition and reply briefing to defendants' motion to dismiss,
16 or in the alternative, stay proceedings and compel arbitration.

17 Under Civil Local Rule 7-4(b), "unless the court expressly orders otherwise pursuant to a
18 party's request made prior to the due date, briefs or memoranda filed with opposition papers may not
19 exceed 25 pages of text and the reply brief or memorandum may not exceed 15 pages of text." Civil
20 Local Rule 7-11(a), in turn, provides that a motion for an order on a miscellaneous administrative
21 matter, including a motion to exceed otherwise applicable page limitations, "must set for the
22 specifically . . . the *reasons supporting the motion* . . ." (emphasis added).

23 The parties fail to provide any explanation in support of the request for ten extra pages for the
24 opposition and reply briefs. Given that defendants' opening brief was well under the 25 page limit
25 pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-2(b), the court does not see why ten extra pages would be necessary for
26 the opposition and reply briefing. Absent any reason(s) in support of the motion, the court DENIES
27 the motion, without prejudice to re-file.

28 IT IS SO ORDERED.


United States District Judge

Dated: January 24, 2013